[Mr. CRAMER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAX ON ELECTRIC, GAS, AND OIL HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to repeal the 5-percent manufacturers excise tax on electric, gas, and oil household appliances. This category of taxable items covers a wide range of products—from electric hand irons and small mixers to water heaters, dishwashing machines, and power mowers.

This excise tax was instituted during the Korean war in order to curtail consumer spending on household appliances, a purpose no longer necessary or desirable.

What is more, this is a regressive tax and places an unfair burden on low-income families. The higher cost of appliances cuts most deeply into the limited salaries of those who earn the least.

This is particularly true since household appliances, such as irons, water heaters, and clothes driers, are no longer a luxury for the few, but a standard purchase of the average household.

The amount of revenue raised by the tax is comparatively small. In fiscal year 1964 the manufacturers excise on 20 different kinds of household appliances raised only $77,576,000. This sum seems less significant when viewed against the adverse effects of the tax on the consumer, and the burden of bookkeeping and collecting it places upon the manufacturer and the Treasury Department. It is worth noting in this connection that the Treasury must maintain a special staff to determine what is and is not taxable under this category.

President Johnson has called for a thorough overhaul of our outdated excise tax structure. As an essential part of this review and revision of excise taxes, I urge the repeal of this manufacturers excise tax on household appliances.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PARTS IV AND V

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues parts IV and V of the recent series from the New York Herald Tribune on "New York City in Crisis." These two installments contain the views of the mayor of New York on the city's status and the views of some of the city's other citizens.

The two articles appeared in the Herald Tribune on January 27, 1965, and follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE MAYOR'S VIEW: A TOWN OF "THROBBING VITALITY"

(By Don Ross)

(This is the greatest city in the world, but for many of its 8 million citizens it is no longer the greatest place in which to live. Hundreds of these citizens—including Mayor Wagner—have responded to the deeply disturbing problems of a city in crisis, as reported by the Herald Tribune's special investigative team. The Tribune welcomes all responses, as the "New York City in Crisis" continues today, with the hope that out of criticism can come renewed civic creativity: whether in terms of individual action, a banding together of leading citizens, or a change in the pattern of municipal responsibility.)

Instead of being on the economic toboggan, as has been suggested, Mayor Wagner told a group of business leaders yesterday, New York City is "full of bright and cheering aspects" and is on the "upswing."

The mayor admitted that the city has serious problems and he said "We are working at all of them." As for some of them, he said, "I freely admit and frequently say that we must do more than we are doing.

"The central fact," the mayor said, "is that our economic indicators show a throbbing vitality, which augurs well for continued growth and progress."

Mr. Wagner spoke at the 28th Calvin Bullock Forum at 1 Wall Street. Calvin Bullock is an investment management firm specializing in mutual funds. Hugh Bullock, the son of the late Calvin Bullock, introduced the mayor.

The city, the Mayor said, "is in more vigorous, dynamic, and robust condition, both economically and socially, than any other great metropolis in the country or the world."

To drive his optimism home the mayor listed these "economic indicators":

1. In the 6-year period 1958–63, nine new jobs in private industry were created in the city for every eight jobs lost. The mayor admitted, however, that "substantial job losses, primarily in manufacturing" occurred during the period. Of the new jobs created 45,000 were in manufacturing in 169 different categories and the balance were in service occupations and office work.

2. In 1964 employment exceeded the totals in 1963 for each month from January through November, the latest month for which figures are available. In this time, unemployment fell by half a percentage point.

3. Department-store sales in the city were 9 percent greater in 1964 than 1963, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

4. Deposits in city savings banks increased by 10 percent last year over the year before. Total deposits of all banks and savings and loan associations in the city were almost $68 billion.

5. While the value of new building construction declined last year, the estimated construction cost of building plans filed in 1964—"the real indicator for the future"—increased more than 16 percent. These plans totaled $693.4 million as against $598.2 million in 1963.

6. New York's garment center is still the biggest in the world, producing 70 percent of the country's women's and children's clothing.

7. New York is the largest retail center in the Nation. Sales last year totaled $12.2 billion.

8. New York drew more tourists in 1964—14 million—than Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Montreal and Toronto combined. They spent more than $1 billion.

9. New York is the largest single manufacturing center in the Nation, producing more than 11 percent of the national total manufactures last year. Fifteen hundred new factory buildings have been constructed in the city in the last 10 years, and 33,000 manufacturers have a payroll of $5.3 billion.

10. More and more of the Nation's major corporations are moving their headquarters here. At present more than 27 percent of the top 500 firms in the country have their headquarters here.

11. One out of every seven persons employed in real estate and insurance in the country works in New York.

12. Ten of the Nation's 50 largest commercial banks have headquarters in New York. The New York banks have assets of $51.5 billion and hold nearly a quarter of all the industrial loans outstanding in the country.

13. The personal income of New York residents could buy all the goods sold in every department store in America.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CRISIS COMPLAINTS: A CIVIC RESPONSE

(By Barry Gottehrer)

For the last 6 months, Miss Thelma Burdict and Wilbert Tatum have been trying to set up a meeting with Mayor Wagner.

Miss Burdict, as chairman of the Cooper Square Community Development Committee and Businessmen's Association, and Mr. Tatum, as executive secretary, urgently wanted to discuss the changing plans for the long-delayed controversial urban renewal project in their area.

But the mayor, despite a promise from an aid and a continuing stream of calls and letters from Cooper Square area residents, never held the meeting.

Late Monday afternoon, the telephone rang in Miss Burdict's office at the Church of All Nations, of which she is director. The call was from Milton Mollen, head of the city's housing program. After more than 6 months, the mayor, according to his aid, would be delighted to meet with a group of Cooper Square residents and businessmen on Friday afternoon at city hall.

"We'd been trying for 6 months and he didn't call us until 6 p.m. on Monday," said Mr. Tatum. "Your series on New York did it. It's about time someone started stirring things up in this city."

PREMATURE

The controversy over Cooper Square dates back to its first listing as an urban-renewal project in 1959. At the time, the area's residents and businessmen had fought against plans to wipe out the admittedly deteriorating housing in the East Houston and Chrystie Street area and replace it with middle-income housing. They favored a public housing project, which they could afford, in the area. Finally, when the city planning commission voted approval for the low-rent, public housing project for the area, the residents thought they had won. When they learned that the mayor's executive committee on housing also reportedly favored the public housing project, they were sure they had won.

Their elation, however, was decidedly premature. Despite the actions of the planning commission and the reported action of the mayor and his housing experts, the board of estimate last November refused to authorize the use of the site for public housing.

The report persisted that local leaders had been granted the middle-income project (to be sponsored by the San Gennaro Society) in exchange for their support on the Lower Manhattan Expressway.

This is where the controversy has stood until Monday, with the area's residents un-

to find out exactly what was going to happen.

Mr. Tatum was only one of several hundred New Yorkers who have responded by phone and by mail to the first 2 days of "New York City in Crisis," which started Monday in the Herald Tribune.

Angry, disturbed or afraid, yet all convinced that the city had let them down, these New Yorkers have pointed out dozens of examples of city negligence and indecision in which the citizens of this city have been victimized by its government.

These charges are currently being investigated by members of the Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" staff.

The charges so far touch on almost every area of municipal service—from disgust over the city's urban renewal program (in Bellevue South, on the upper West Side, in Brooklyn Bridge South, and in several others) to unsubstantiated charges of municipal graft and police corruption and negligence.

"Narcotics and crime are just tearing this apart," said one Brooklyn detective. "Why don't we do something about it? They talk about 50,000 narcotics addicts in Manhattan. That's a joke. There are that many in my precinct."

Other areas of repeated criticism include: Overcrowded subways, unpaved highways, unprosecuted slumlords, the unchecked sale of alcohol to minors, high salaries of the mayor's top aids coupled with the city's worsening financial condition, the low caliber of many of the city's longtime personnel, the low state of public schools, the shortage of middle-income housing, the lack of adequate protection in the streets, the loss of businesses, city hospitals, and the ugliness of the city.

BLAME

With only two exceptions, the callers placed most of the blame for the city's problems at the feet of the mayor.

"A citizen begins to wonder if he has a democratic government when he gets assurances about one thing from city hall only to find out the next day or week that the assurances mean absolutely nothing," says Frederick Smedley, a member of community planning board No. 3 in Manhattan. "The time has come for the people of this city to get angry and stop accepting promises that mean nothing."

Bill Fitts

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 836, TO PROVIDE A REMEDY FOR PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged today to present to the Judiciary Committee the following statement supporting legislation to provide a remedy for what is a potentially disastrous situation. My remarks are directed toward a solution of the problem as suggested in my bill H.R. 836.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 836, TO PROVIDE A METHOD FOR DETERMINING PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, FEBRUARY 10, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to share with this distinguished committee my views on the formulation of legislation to secure continuity and stability of executive leadership in the event of presidential disability.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the Philadelphia Convention in 1787, many practitioners and students of government have been concerned about the ambiguity of one word in article II of our Constitution. Article II, section 1, clause 5 states, in part, that "in case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President. * * *"

The central word of concern in this clause is the word, "inability." The earliest concern about the meaning of the word was expressed at the Constitutional Convention, when delegate John Dickinson, of Delaware, contending that the word was "too vague," appropriately asked, "What is the extent of the term 'disability' and who is to be the judge of it?" Today—almost 178 years later—this committee meets to raise the same question and to attempt to resolve the same fundamental problems which it implies. The only difference is that, today, the urgency for a sound solution is made more manifest by reason of critical events in the American experience.

Let us take a look at some of these events. There are two of an especially "classical" nature. The first event evolved out of the circumstances in the aftermath of the shooting of President James A. Garfield. Garfield was cut down by an assassin's bullet on July 2, 1881, and lay stricken for a period of 80 days before death finally came on September 19. Shortly after Garfield was wounded, many in Government—including some of Garfield's Cabinet—urged Vice President Chester A. Arthur to assume the powers and duties of the Presidency; but these urgings sparked a controversy which centered on the question of whether the assumption of these responsibilities implied also the assumption of the office itself. Some held that if Arthur assumed these powers, he would in fact become President; and that Garfield would be unable to regain office if he subsequently recovered. Because of the allegedly doubtful legality of taking over the functions of the Presidency when the President was alive, plus the fear of creating the impression of being a usurper, Arthur refused to act.

Another event, with somewhat parallel circumstances and implications, took place in 1919–21 with the disability of Woodrow Wilson. During the last 18 months of his second administration, Wilson suffered two strokes and was left generally unable, physically and mentally, to discharge the functions of his office. Vice President Thomas R. Marshall was urged to assume the powers and duties of the office, but troubled by the same doubts that assailed Chester Arthur nearly 40 years before, he refused to act. Once again, the question loomed large: "Is the assumption of the powers and duties of the office of President tantamount to the assumption of the office itself?"

This vexatious question was raised once more in the last decade when President Eisenhower suffered illnesses in 1955, 1956, and 1957. I need not document the circumstances of these occasions, for we can all recall the danger that can be sensed when a President is incapacitated, particularly in the nuclear age.

After his last ailment, President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon made an agreement with respect to Presidential disability. This kind of understanding has been repeated in the two succeeding administrations. Such arrangements governing the transfer of power in the event of the unexpected raise serious questions of a constitutional nature which cry out for an answer in this matter of presidential disability. Article II of the Constitution is unmistakably clear in its intent: "* * * the Congress may by law provide for the case of * * * inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President should be elected." The Constitution does not tell us how to determine Presidential disability; nor does it tell us how to return the powers and duties of the office to the President after his disability. But this great document did make it incumbent upon future lawmakers to grapple with and solve this problem.

Let us therefore act with dispatch in this session of Congress. Let us act for two reasons: (1) So that there will be no question as to the exact nature of the transfer of power; and (2) so that the decision regarding this transfer will be judicious and circumspect.

I was delighted to see that the President, in a recent message to Congress, urged action in this matter of presidential disability by calling for a constitutional amendment. In this message, he stressed that, while "we are prepared for the possibility of a President's death, we are all but defenseless against the probability of a President's incapacity by injury, illness, senility or other affliction." I could not agree more with this observation. Reacting in the same way to this deficiency in our system of government, I introduced on January 4 of this session a bill—H.R. 836—to remedy this problem. I submit that this bill would give effect to the goals enunciated in the President's message, and I, therefore, urge its consideration.

Basically, H.R. 836 provides a method for determining presidential inability.

First, a simple majority of the House of Representatives would request the Senate, in the form of a resolution, to determine whether the President is unable to discharge his responsibilities. Upon adoption, the resolution would be forwarded to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who would immediately convene the Senate in special session for the purpose of determining whether the President was disabled.

Second, if two-thirds of the Senators present and voting determine that the President is unable to discharge his responsibilities, the Senate would, by a resolution of two-thirds of those present and voting, direct the Vice President to serve as acting President for the duration of the period that the President is disabled.

Implicit in this method of determination is the idea that the Vice President would act as President during the disability period; he would not be President. We could thus eliminate the problem faced by Vice Presidents Chester Arthur and Thomas Marshall, who feared that discharging the powers and duties of the Presidency implied irrevocable assumption of the office.

This bill also provides a solution to another question that has long been asked: How does the President go about regaining his office once he has recovered from his disability?

First, a majority of those present and voting in either House of Congress would adopt a resolution directing the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to convene a special session of the Senate. The purpose of this Senate session would be to consider revoking its previous determination of Presidential disability.

Second, if two-thirds of the Senators present and voting determine that the President is able to discharge his responsibilities, the Senate would declare, by a resolution adopted by two-thirds of those present and voting, that the powers and duties of the Office of the President are restored to the President.

Mr. Chairman, when an amendment to the Constitution is under discussion, utmost caution must be exercised with respect to its language and intent. This responsibility demands insight and foresight of a nature possessed by those who met in Philadelphia to draw up the law of the land many years ago.

I urge that the proposed amendment under consideration anticipate the needs of

future generations. For this reason, I should like to point to another facet of H.R. 836, specifically that portion which deals with the disability of the Vice President, or any other individual acting as President.

Certainly, the Vice President is just as mortal a man as is the President. He is generally subject to the same illnesses which could afflict a President. Appropriate steps should therefore be taken to protect this Nation in the event of the disability of a Vice President, or any other individual who acts as President. In H.R. 836, I suggest that the methods of determining this disability and restoring the powers and duties of the Presidency be he same as those applying to the President.

Let us not be incomplete in our efforts to assure proper Presidential leadership. History warns us that since 1841 a total of eight Vice Presidents have had to assume the powers and duties of the Presidency after the death of the President. I strongly urge that we include in any constitutional amendment a provision governing the transfer of power to another who would act as President in the event that a Vice President becomes disabled while discharging the duties of the office.

The objective of H.R. 836 is unquestionably in accord with that enunciated in the President's recent message. Above all, however, I strongly recommend that pertinent and realistic improvements be made in this matter of disability. Without improvements we are a horse-and-buggy government in the jet age.

NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA ON FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

(Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, as a native of one of the outstanding tobacco-producing areas of our country, I have taken great pride in the fact that our tobacco program has always operated at a very minimum cost and at the same time has provided the tobacco grower and his family a fair return for their labor and investment.

Under existing law since 1940, the Secretary of Agriculture has annually on or before December 1, proclaimed a national marketing quota in pounds of Flue-cured tobacco for the following growing season and allotted the number of acres for the production of such poundage.

It is interesting to note that for the 1940 crop, the marketing quota proclaimed in poundage was 618 million pounds and that 758,210 acres were allotted for such production. That year the Flue-cured States produced 760 million pounds for an average yield of 1,025 pounds per acre. This was 142 million pounds in excess of the marketing quota.

The marketing quota in poundage proclaimed for the 1964 crop was 1,124,997,830 pounds, and 638,240 acres were allotted for such production. On this acreage allotment, which was 119,970 acres less than in 1940, we produced 1,383 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco for an average yield of 2,203 pounds per acre. The 1964 yield was more than double that of 1940.

The fallacy of attempting to relate annual marketing quotas in pounds to an acreage control program becomes crystal clear in the experience of the last 10 years of our program. The acreage allotment for 1954 was 1,053,135 acres; allotment for 1964 was 638,240 acres. In spite of this 40-percent reduction in acreage, the 1964 crop of Flue-cured tobacco, in pounds, was larger than that produced in 1954. Ten percent of this acreage cut was for the 1964 crop, yet we produced more pounds than in 1963. During the 1-year period, the yield per acre increased 11½ percent.

The growers cannot be blamed for increasing their yields as their acreage is cut. The fault is with the system itself, and I believe it is now the feeling of the majority of our growers that some basic adjustment must be made in the program, if it is to survive.

There are many opinions on how to solve best the problem facing our tobacco program. For that reason, I have today introduced a bill, as a starting point, in an effort to bring stability to the tobacco program and to assure a fair return to our growers.

It is my strong belief that our growers should have an opportunity to make their own decision—at the ballot box—with respect to the type of program they believe would best fit their long-range needs. Legislation must be passed by the Congress for our growers to have an opportunity to express themselves by their vote in this important matter.

It should be clearly understood that if legislation is enacted in sufficient time to apply to the 1965 growing season and our Flue-cured growers approve the acreage-poundage proposal, then around 14.5 percent of the 19½-percent acreage reduction for 1965 would be restored for their 1965 crop.

Very probably, other Members of Congress representing their tobacco-growing areas will introduce legislation approaching this problem from other directions. We need and solicit the views of all affected.

I am confident that my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee, who over the years has been a champion for tobacco growers and all forms of our Nation's agriculture, will be anxious to have the views of our growers and all segments of our tobacco industry.

We must move, and move rapidly, for early hearings on tobacco legislation, if the growers themselves are to have an opportunity to make a choice before planting their 1965 crop.

THE PROBLEM OF AN INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that the problem of unfavorable balance of trade can be solved without increasing the rate of interest. This is admittedly a problem because some American investors utilize their capital abroad to obtain higher interest rates.

However, raising the domestic interest rate would be soaking the individual or businessman who must borrow. It would not only be unfair to borrowers, but it could also damage our economy by drying up purchasing and expansion.

Before such a drastic step is taken, other ways of solving the balance-of-payments problem must be tried.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GALLAGHER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSMAN GILBERT'S VOTER REGISTRATION BILL

(Mr. GILBERT (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 I introduced H.R. 4427, to establish a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission. I am pleased to see that so many of my colleagues are sponsoring this or similar bills, which to me is very encouraging and indicates the chances for passage of meaningful legislation in this field.

The deplorable activities such as those currently practiced in Selma, Ala., to prevent Negro citizens from voting, sharply point up the need for legislative action. In spite of voting rights provisions of civil rights acts already passed by Congress, it is a well-known fact that discrimination on account of race exists in many parts of our country. Congress must take decisive, effective, and prompt action to remedy this situation.

I have asked the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on my bill as soon as possible.

My bill would establish a six-member, bipartisan Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission, empowered to appoint its own registrars to supervise registration when a pattern of racial discrimination has been discovered. The Commission would thus be free to bypass the courts, where voting suits in the past have been tied up for long periods of time. My bill would give the Commission jurisdiction over State as well as Federal elections. The provision setting up voting registrars in the 1964 Civil Rights Act has proven ineffective largely because of long delays in the courts. My bill would

provide adequate means of appealing bad decisions of the Commission, but would make sure voting is not denied in the process.

My voter registration bill would also make a fourth-grade education sufficient evidence to exempt any would-be voter from taking a literacy test in State elections. My aim is to end, once and for all, the fradulent device of the literacy test to deprive a citizen of his right to vote. The States would be required to accept the decision of registrars appointed by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful that in our great democracy where a citizen is expected to pay his taxes, to serve in the military and make other contributions to his community and his country, he can—at the same time—be deprived of his right to vote. We send our military men to far corners of the earth to fight for the freedom of others, and we deny it in the form of the precious right to vote, to many of our own citizens.

I call on all of my colleagues in the House to think seriously about this situation, and to join me in taking whatever legislative action is necessary to secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race and color.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today is an extremely important anniversary. One year ago today the House of Representatives first passed the 1964 civil rights bill. It took many months more before final enactment was achieved. The bill had to withstand a very long filibuster before the Senate was able to vote upon it and the bill could be returned to the House for final passage on July 2, 1964, nearly 5 months later.

The overwhelming vote the bill received a year ago today, 290 to 139, was crucial in achieving the approval of the Senate. That vote demonstrated the overwhelming support for the bill from both of the major parties and all the various areas of American life including the different religious and ethnic groups, labor and business, city and country, and all the different regions of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend those of my colleagues who were Members of the 88th Congress and who supported this bill. I want to especially commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the support they gave this measure. Republican support was not only essential in passing the civil rights bill, but also in achieving the national consensus so necessary for the law to have maximum effectiveness.

Had I been a Member of this body at that time, I would have considered it one of the great honors of my life to have been able to cast my vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I am emphasizing this point so that no one could ever be mistaken about my feeling that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a great step forward in guaranteeing equal rights to every American regardless of race. But this 89th Congress has its own responsibility not to delay in providing effective guarantees of "equal justice under law" for every American, regardless of race. As I mentioned yesterday afternoon when I reported on my recent trip to Selma, Ala., I feel very strongly that we need additional Federal civil rights legislation. There is no doubt that only Federal action can eliminate arbitrary and discriminatory obstacles to the right to vote. And we must do this at all levels of government: Federal, State, and local. The assassinations of President Kennedy, Medgar Evers, Michael Chaney, James Schwerner, and Andrew Goodman dramatically and so tragically illustrated the fact that the basic guarantees of "life, liberty, and property" are the jurisdictions of State and local government, not the National Government.

Surely the main point of the American experience is that democracy can ultimately be guaranteed only if all citizens are able to participate freely in the political process. Otherwise "the consent of the governed" becomes a mockery of American democracy instead of one of its proudest claims.

Mr. Speaker, finally may I again commend my colleagues who voted for the 1964 Civil Rights Act. I feel sure that we in the 89th Congress will be able to live up to the record set by the 88th Congress and also be a Congress that furthered the American dream of "liberty and justice for all."

NEW CHAIRMAN OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OUTLINES ROSY FUTURE FOR SAVINGS AND LOANS

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased when President Johnson recently selected my good friend, John Horne, to be Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

You will recall the excellent job that he did while serving as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. It was under his guidance that the great strides were made in the small business investment company program.

Today I am including in the RECORD the first speech given by John Horne as the new Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. I am sure that all of us will be extremely interested in his remarks and suggestions because of the tremendous and positive impact savings and loan institutions have on the American economy.

SPEECH PREPARED BY JOHN E. HORNE FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 1, 1965

It is a privilege for me to address this Legislative Conference of the United States Savings and Loan League. I could add that it is an unexpected privilege because up until a very few weeks ago, as many of you know, I had expected to be in San Francisco at this time. A good deal of attention has been paid to President Johnson's ability to persuade others. I can assure you from experience that his fame in this regard is well deserved.

I

This legislative conference of your league is a most fitting occasion for my initial statement as Chairman of the Board. The work of this legislative conference is important, I believe, not only for the specific decisions and recommendations that it makes, but because its annual convocation is a symbol recognizing the ever changing nature of our Nation, our economy, and your industry.

The President, in his inaugural address, noted that "ours is a time of change—rapid and fantastic change." What is true of our Nation is equally pertinent to the subjects with which this conference deals. Neither your work nor that of the Board will ever be complete and finished. Our business and laws and regulations will never be fixed in immutable form. Some find this aggravating or upsetting. For those who will look, it is what the President referred to as "the excitement of becoming * * * always trying and always gaining."

This approach, this desire for improvement and advancement, has made possible the fruitful and full life most Americans enjoy today. From the oxcart to the jet, from the antiquated credit practices or no credit at all to the modern-day mortgage arrangements, from the isolated and relatively ineffective building and loan societies to the coordinated and powerful system you represent today, from little or no consultation with Members of Congress on legislative matters to informed and helpful trade associations such as your own—these and other developments testify to the changing nature of our life and to the worthwhileness of our efforts for progress.

Some other gains—partial gains—were achieved in the Housing Act of 1964. This conference and the league played a most helpful role in enabling the administration to obtain the enactment of that law. Its provisions contain much of interest and value for this industry and the public, and have kept the board active a good part of this fall and winter translating the new investment authority into implementing regulations.

I shall not take your time to make a list of all the new provisions, but I would like to make brief reference to two proposals recently published that deal with service corporations and urban renewal.

In the service corporation regulation the Board would give approval to investment by Federal associations in any general service corporations serving the entire industry, in the manner of New Jersey's Central Corp. of Savings and Loan Associations. At the same time, we recognize that there is possible an almost infinite variety of corporations of a more limited nature—more limited as to members or as to purpose. These the Board would consider, under the second paragraph of the regulation, on the basis of the specific facts involved. In either case, the statute imposes an overall investment ceiling for such purposes of 1 percent of assets.

The urban renewal regulation is designed to give Federal associations greater freedom and flexibility to participate in the preservation of the community centers in which so many of our institutions are located and from which they draw their sustenance. Here is an opportunity for an ever more vital role in a matter of the highest importance to the future not only of our society but of your institution itself. We will appreciate your constructive suggestions, and will be most interested in the use you make of this authority.